

Filed 5/1/19 P. v. Pollard CA2/4

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.
---

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SHOWNDANYELL POLLARD,

Defendant and Appellant.

B291439

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA466756)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Ronald S. Coen, Judge. Affirmed.

Vanessa Place, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

An information charged appellant Showndanyell Pollard with human trafficking to commit another crime (Pen. Code, § 236.1, subd. (b)),<sup>1</sup> pimping (§ 266h, subd. (a)), and pandering by encouragement (§ 266i, subd. (a)(2)). The information further alleged that appellant had suffered two prior serious or violent felony convictions (§§ 667, subd. (e)(2)(C), 1170.12, subd. (c)(2)(C)) and two prior convictions resulting in prison or county jail sentences (§ 667.5, subd. (b)).

At trial, the victim testified she had worked for appellant as a prostitute and would give him the money she made. She stated another woman was also working for appellant at the time. After his arrest, appellant told police the victim was his “ho.” In a subsequent call from jail, appellant told another person that he was with the “ho bitch” (referring to the victim) before his arrest, and had found out she was having sex with “some other pimp . . . .” His police interview and jail call were recorded and played for the jury.

The jury found appellant guilty of pimping, but acquitted him of the human trafficking and pandering charges. In a bifurcated proceeding, appellant admitted the prior conviction allegations. The trial court sentenced appellant to 14 years in state prison, consisting of the high term of six years, doubled for the two prior serious or violent

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

felony convictions, plus one year for each of the two prior prison or county jail sentences.

Appellant timely appealed. After examining the record, appointed appellate counsel filed a brief raising no issues, but asking this court to independently review the record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442 (*Wende*). On November 16, 2018, we sent a letter advising appellant he had 30 days to submit a brief or letter raising any contention or argument he wished this court to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied no arguable issue exists. By virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, appellant has received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL  
REPORTS**

MANELLA, P. J.

We concur:

COLLINS, J.

DUNNING, J.\*

---

\*Retired Judge of the Orange County Superior Court assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.